

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
Attorney Docket Number 13943US01

In re Application of:)
MPR) **Electronically Filed**
Serial No.: 10/600,162) **Date: November 20, 2008**
Filing Date: 6/20/2003)
FOR: SYSTEM, METHOD, AND)
APPARATUS FOR)
SIMULTANEOUSLY DISPLAYING)
MULTIPLE VIDEO STREAMS)
Examiner: Diep)
Confirmation No.: 9706)
Art Unit No. 2621)

REQUEST FOR PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REVIEW

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This amendment is filed in response to the Office Action mailed 8/20/2008.

REMARKS

Claims 17-22 are presently pending and stand rejected. Claims 1-16 were cancelled without prejudice. Assignee respectfully requests pre-appeal brief review of the rejections to claims 17-22.

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gatto. Claim 17 recites, among other limitations, "a video decoder for decompressing a plurality of compressed video streams".

Examiner has indicated that Gatto teaches "an interactive television devices and systems comprising the same system for providing a plurality of videos simultaneous display, said system comprising: a video decoder for decompressing a plurality of compressed video streams, thereby resulting in a plurality of decompressed video streams, wherein each of said decompressed video streams comprises a plurality of pictures (paragraph 0007 shows only a video decoder for accepting a plurality of input stream)".

Assignee respectfully traverses. Gatto, Paragraph 0007 describes "a video signal decoder". Even if the "video signal decoder" is "accepting a plurality of input stream[s]", Gatto does not teach that a "video signal decoder" for "decompressing a plurality of compressed video streams". In fact Gatto, 0007 does not even teach that the input streams are compressed. Note that Gatto 0007, Lines 10-11 teaches "the analog bus including a video signal decoder coupled to the input and a video signal encoder coupled to the output". Gatto does not teach that analog signals are compressed. Assignee calls Examiner's attention to Figure 1, and respectfully submits that "video signal

decoder" corresponds to "HDTV/PAL/NTSC Decoder 130", as opposed to "MPEGx Decodeer 154".

In the previous office action, Examiner read "a video decoder for decompressing a plurality of compressed video streams" onto Gatto, Paragraph 0040¹. Even if Examiner deems that Gatto "graphics engine 192 may include ... one or more (MPEGx for example) video decoders 154" to include one "video decoder 154" if/when Gatto displays multiple streams in Figure 8, Gatto also teaches a "second graphics engine 148". Thus, Gatto does not teach "a video decoder for decompressing a plurality of compressed video streams".

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reason, Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection to claim 17 and dependent claims 18-22 and requests that such rejections be withdrawn.

Additionally, claim 17 also recites, among other limitations, "a register for indicating a past prediction picture, and a future prediction picture for each of the plurality of compressed video streams".

Examiner has indicated that "Gatto discloses the use of an events manager slave module which manages all ... '...current and future...' events, and further discloses an events database (Gatto: paragraph [0142], lines 1-10). When those events are video based, particularly, compressed video based (Gatto: paragraph [0040], lines 10-20), a prediction index is generated for that video events database. Accordingly, the Examiner maintains that the limitation is met." Office Action at 3.

¹ Examiner actually cited paragraph 0046 in the Previous Office Action at 3. However, Gatto paragraph 46 does not include the passage quoted by Examiner. It is believed that Examiner intended to cite Gatto, paragraph 0040.

Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection and submits that "indicating a past prediction picture, and a future prediction picture for each of the plurality of compressed video streams" does not read on "current and future events". Additionally, Gatto, paragraph 0040 states that "decompression of video streams into and from the MPEGx standard is carried out in *hardware*, thereby enabling a more efficient use of processor resources and encoding and decoding functions that are independent of the current processing load on the internal processor 146 of the circuitry 100." Accordingly, Assignee respectfully submits that "a register for indicating a past prediction picture, and a future prediction picture for each of the plurality of compressed video streams" does not read on the "events database (Gatto: paragraph [0142], lines 1-10)."

Examiner states on page 4 of the rejection that Gatto teaches "a register for indicating a past prediction picture, and a future prediction picture for each of the plurality of compressed video streams (paragraph 0009 shows MPEG which comprises I, P, and B frames and since MPEG involves predictive coding, registers or frame memories must be reserved at the decoder so one can predict pictures in the GOP based on those stored reference frames)". Examiner provided the same basis in the previous office action. Based on Examiner's remarks on page 3, it is believed that Examiner intended to substitute the basis for meeting the limitation described in the previous office action with the basis described on page 3.

However, to the extent that Examiner intends that the remarks on page 4 to meet the limitation, Assignee also traverses for the reasons indicated in the May 2, 2008 response to the previous office action at 5-7.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reason, Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection to claim 17 and dependent claims 18-22 and requests that such rejections be withdrawn.

Claim 21 recites, among other limitations "wherein the display engine examines the register, selects the pictures indicated by register for display, and concatenates the pictures indicated for display by the register".

Examiner has indicated that Gatto teaches "the display engine examines the register, selects the pictures indicated by register for display, and concatenates the pictures indicated for display by the register; ... (fig. 8 and paragraphs 0036, 0040, 0142-0145: the events manager slave module 1208 may access an events data base 1222".

As best as Assignee can ascertain, it appears that Examiner is reading the "display engine" onto the "the events manager slave module 1208". Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection because Gatto does not teach that "the events manager slave module 1208" "concatenates the pictures".

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reason, Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection to claim 21 and requests that such rejection be withdrawn.

Dated: November 20, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



Mirut Dalal
Reg. No. 44,052
Attorney for Applicants

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison Street
Chicago, Illinois 60661
Telephone: (312) 775-8000
Facsimile: (312) 775-8100